

**COURT OF APPEALS  
DECISION  
DATED AND FILED**

**May 28, 2014**

Diane M. Fremgen  
Clerk of Court of Appeals

**NOTICE**

This opinion is subject to further editing. If published, the official version will appear in the bound volume of the Official Reports.

A party may file with the Supreme Court a petition to review an adverse decision by the Court of Appeals. See WIS. STAT. § 808.10 and RULE 809.62.

**Appeal Nos. 2012AP2297  
2012AP2298  
2012AP2299  
2012AP2300  
2012AP2301  
2012AP2302  
2012AP2463  
2012AP2625**

**Cir. Ct. Nos. 2012FO303  
2012FO304  
2012FO305  
2012FO306  
2012FO307  
2012FO347  
2006CV291  
2012FO362**

**STATE OF WISCONSIN**

**IN COURT OF APPEALS  
DISTRICT III**

---

**Nos. 2012AP2297, 2012AP2298  
2012AP2299, 2012AP2300,  
2012AP2301, 2012AP2302,  
2012AP2625**

**VILLAGE OF TIGERTON,**

**PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT,**

**V.**

**DONALD J. MINNIECHESKE,**

**DEFENDANT-APPELLANT.**

---

---

**NO. 2012AP2463**

**DONALD J. MINNIECHESKE,**

**PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,**

**V.**

**VILLAGE OF TIGERTON, JOHN GUTHO, SHAWANO COUNTY,  
ROBERT NORDIN AND MICHAEL NORDIN,**

**DEFENDANTS-RESPONDENTS.**

---

APPEALS from judgments and orders of the circuit court for  
Shawano County: JAMES R. HABECK, Judge. *Affirmed.*

Before Hoover, P.J., Mangerson and Stark, JJ.

¶1 PER CURIAM. In a thirty-nine-page brief, Donald Minniecheske, pro se, accuses a circuit court judge, Village of Tigerton and Shawano County officials, various attorneys, the Department of Natural Resources, and surveyors Robert and Michael Nordin of various criminal acts, including fraud, racketeering, perjury, and theft, in what amounts to an alleged two-decade conspiracy to deprive him of land.

¶2 The judgments and orders from which he appeals are straightforward. In Shawano County case Nos. 2012FO303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 347, and 362, Minniecheske was issued citations for theft, apparently for taking wood from property belonging to the Village of Tigerton that Minniecheske

believes he owns.<sup>1</sup> In Shawano County case No. 2006CV291, Minniecheske filed suit to quiet title. The circuit court granted summary judgment for the Village of Tigerton, John Gutho, Shawano County, and Robert and Michael Nordin, dismissing Minniecheske's claims with prejudice. Minniecheske has filed multiple motions and affidavits to obtain relief from that judgment and reopen the case, the latest of which was denied on September 21, 2012.

¶3 We conclude Minniecheske has not presented any valid arguments for relief from any of the challenged judgments and orders. Minniecheske's brief is incomprehensible, with facts, argument, and opinion scattered in no apparent order. The basis for his appeals is unclear, as his primary concern appears to be events that occurred over twenty years ago. His arguments are undeveloped themes reflecting no legitimate legal reasoning. On the whole, we conclude whatever issues Minniecheske wished to raise regarding the orders and judgments subject to this appeal have been inadequately briefed, and we therefore need not address them. *See State v. Pettit*, 171 Wis. 2d 627, 646, 492 N.W.2d 633 (Ct. App. 1992).

¶4 In addition, Minniecheske's appellate brief does not comport with WIS. STAT. RULE 809.19(1).<sup>2</sup> That subsection sets forth the requirements for an orderly presentation of fact and argument. WISCONSIN STAT. RULE 809.19(1)(e)

---

<sup>1</sup> CCAP records show that in case no. 2012FO303, Minniecheske was found not guilty following a court trial. To the extent Minniecheske is not an aggrieved party, he cannot appeal the judgment. *See Koller v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 190 Wis. 2d 263, 266, 526 N.W.2d 799 (Ct. App. 1994).

<sup>2</sup> All references to the Wisconsin Statutes are to the 2011-12 version unless otherwise noted.

requires that arguments be arranged in the order of the statement of issues presented. Minniecheske's statement of issues presented does not mention any of the judgments or orders appealed from, and his arguments do not appear in any logical order. Failure to follow the Rules of Appellate Procedure is grounds for dismissal of the appeal. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.83(2).

¶5 Moreover, most of Minniecheske's argument is unsupported by references to legal authority. When he does provide legal authority, he does not explain the authority's relevance or connect it to his argument in any meaningful way. Arguments unsupported by references to legal authority will not be considered. *Id.* The same is true of unsupported and explained statements. *See M.C.I., Inc. v. Elbin*, 146 Wis. 2d 239, 244-45, 430 N.W.2d 366 (Ct. App. 1988).

*By the Court.*—Judgments and orders affirmed.

This opinion will not be published. *See* WIS. STAT. RULE 809.23(1)(b)5.

